Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KEVIN-PAUL EL WOODRUFF,

Plaintiff,

v.

MASON MCDUFFIE MORTGAGE CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 19-cv-04300-WHO

ORDER DECLINING TO ADOPT REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION: CONSTRUING GOVERNMENT'S NOTICE AS NOTICE OF REMOVAL

Re: Dkt. Nos. 5, 10

On March 22, 2019, pro se plaintiff Kevin-Paul El Woodruff¹ initiated this action for wrongful foreclosure and a number of related claims against a several defendants, including federal defendant Ginne Mae Guaranteed Remic Trust 2017-134 Trust ("Ginnie Mae"). [Dkt. No. 1]. Woodruff initially filed his complaint in the Superior Court for Contra Costa County, where it was assigned case number C19-00559. *Id.* But on July 26, 2019, Woodruff removed his own case to this court where it was originally before Hon. Joseph Spero. Id.

Judge Spero issued a report and recommendation, recommending that this case be remanded sua sponte to state court. [Dkt. No. 5]. He reasoned that under 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a), only a defendant may remove a case and the Supreme Court has held that federal courts lack jurisdiction to consider cases removed by a plaintiff. Id. (citing Shamrock Oil & Gas Corp. v. Sheets, 313 U.S. 100 (1941); Progressive W. Ins. Co. v. Perciado, 479 F.3d 1014, 1017–18 (9th Cir. 2007)). Because not all parties consented to the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), this case was reassigned to me on August 7, 2019. [Dkt. No. 9].

Woodruff also uses names such as Chief Wanag Stutson and Wanag Tahatan-Bey. Woodruff uses a variety of unconventional capitalizations and punctuations for his names. The difference in capitalization and punctuation is of no legal consequence.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

On August 15, 2019, Ginnie Mae filed a notice of intent to remove requesting that I do not adopt Judge Spero's report and recommendation. [Dkt. No. 10]. Ginnie Mae states that it had initially intended to remove this case but Woodruff removed it first. Id. It asks that rather than remanding this case now, only for it to have to remove it again, I should instead treat its filing as it if were a notice of removal filed simultaneously with Woodruff's notice of removal.

Ginnie Mae's request is granted. As the court stated in Sanchez v. Homestead Funding Corp., No. 13-cv-01850, 2014 WL 4145546, at *2 (D. Conn. Aug. 19, 2014):

> Ginnie Mae is a corporation that is wholly owned by the United States within the Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"). 12 U.S.C. § 1717(a)(2)(A). All of the "benefits and burdens" of Ginnie Mae's operations "inure solely to the Secretary of the Treasury," id. § 1722, and all of Ginnie Mae's powers and duties are "vested in the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and . . . administered under the direction of the Secretary," id. § 1723(a). Ginnie Mae therefore has the status of a federal agency. See Pension Ben. Guar. Corp. ex rel. St. Vincent Catholic Med. Centers Ret. Plan v. Morgan Stanley Inv. Mgmt. Inc., 712 F.3d 705, 714 n.9 (2d Cir. 2013) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted) ("As securities issued by a federal agency, Ginnie Mae securities carry the full faith and credit of the United States."); Gov't Nat. Mortgage Ass'n v. Terry, 608 F.2d 614, 615 (5th Cir.1979) ("Ginnie Mae is an agency within the meaning of [28 U.S.C. §] 1345 [United States as plaintiff]."); Channer v. Loan Care Serv. Ctr., Inc., No. 11-cv-135, 2011 WL 2437270, at *1 (D. Conn. June 14, 2011) ("Federal jurisdiction is conferred here because [Plaintiff] has sued Ginnie Mae, among others. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1), when a United States agency is sued in state court for an action committed in its official capacity, that agency may remove the action[.]").

As a federal agency, Ginnie Mae has a statutory right of removal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1). Remanding this case and forcing Ginnie Mae to remove it again would waste time and resources both here and at the state court. Accordingly, I decline to adopt Judge Spero's report and recommendation and construe this case as properly removed by Ginnie Mae under 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1).

A Case Management Conference is set for September 24, 2019 at 2 p.m. The parties' Joint

United States District Court Northern District of California

Case Management Statement shall be filed by September 17, 2019.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 22, 2019

